

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,473	02/17/2004	Carel J.L. Van Driel	PHN 16-613A	1391
24737 75	590 07/21/2005		EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			JAIN, RAJ K	
P.O. BOX 3001				
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2664	
			DATE MAILED: 07/21/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/780,473	VAN DRIEL, CAREL J.L.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Raj K. Jain	2664			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repleted in the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period and the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by status any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 I	February 2004.				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ Thi					
· —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 11-16 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrays. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 11-16 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ 	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 February 2004 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected to by the Examination is objected.	re: a) accepted or b) cetion is required if the drawing the left in abeyone.	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the principle application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list. 	nts have been received. Its have been received in ority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2664

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 11-16 examined on the merits.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 11-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,329 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present application claims were made to make the present application claims broader than the patented application.

Comparison of the two applications:

Art Unit: 2664

Claims 11, 12 and 15 of the present application (10/780,473) discloses a network and means for transmission of packets to a primary node according to predetermined transmission properties, further the network includes a first address translation means and a second address translation means for translating the address information back to the initial address information. Further, dependent claim 12 includes a selection means for a selector configured to select packets according to transmission properties contained in the address information in the packet headers.

Similarly, claims 1 and 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,329 B1 also discloses a network for transmission of packets to a primary node according to predetermined transmission properties, further the network includes a first address translation translator and a second address translation translator for translating the address information back to the initial address information. The patented application further includes a selector configured to select packets according to transmission properties contained in the address information in the packet headers, within the independent claims 1 and 5.

The current application does not contain the last limitation within the independent claims, however, it is listed as dependent claim 12. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the independent claims broader in scope without deviation from the main invention at hand by removing one or more of the narrower claim limitations. Thus, both the current application and the U.S. Patent No. 6,721,329 B1, have claim languages that are

Art Unit: 2664

phrased differently to claim the same subject matter, thus they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 15 of the present application (10/780,473) discloses a destination node receiving packets from a plurality of source nodes containing initial address information and performing the first address translation that contains the destination address, the destination node arranged to perform the second address translation back to the initial address information.

Similarly, claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,329 B1 also discloses a primary node or the destination node receiving packets from a plurality of secondary nodes or source nodes containing the initial address information and performing the first address translation that contains the destination address, the primary node arranged to perform the second address translation back to the initial address information.

Thus, both the current application and the U.S. Patent No. 6,721,329 B1, have claim languages that are phrased differently to claim the same subject matter, thus they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claims 13 and 14 of the present application are identical to claims 2 and 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,329 B1.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims of the present application have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 2664

Allowable Subject Matter

Page 5

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claims 11, 15, and 16 are allowed. The prior art discloses a communications system with a plurality of secondary nodes interconnected to one or more primary nodes which are arranged for receiving packets from the secondary nodes, whereby the secondary nodes performs an initial address translation providing information within the packet headers the address of the destination node or the primary node.

The prior art however fails to disclose the destination node or the receiving node performing a "reverse" address translation, translating the address back into the initial address information present in the packets as transmitted from the source node.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raj Jain whose telephone number is 571-272-3145. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

Art Unit: 2664

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on 571-272-3134. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-

2600.

June 22, 2005